LAW OFFICES
FENSTERWALD & ASSOCIATES
SUITE 900, TWIN TOWERS BLDG.
1000 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

(703) 276-9297

BERNARD FENSTERWALD, JR.
BERNARD FENSTERWALD, III
JAMES H. LESAR (D.C. ONLY)

GORDON F. HARRISON (D.C. ONLY)
OF COUNSEL

NEW YORK ASSOCIATES
BASS, ULLMAN & LUSTIGMAN
747 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

(212) 751-9494

SUMMARY OF PARIS TRIP - NOVEMBER 13-22, 1982

I was accompanied on the trip by Prof. Alan Farrell, Chairman of Romance Lanuage Department at Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia, who performed superbly as an interpreter.

At a meeting with two French friends [redacted], we were able to get a summary of certain police files on the subject which are extremely helpful in elucidating the genesis of the Souetre-Mertz-Roux affairs; it started with Roux. A summary of these documents is appended as Appendix A hereto.

Very briefly, the investigation was begun in February, 1964, when a freelance journalist, Louis Assemat-Tessandier, published an article in an obscure French newspaper which outlined his meeting with Michel Roux in Montreal circa January 20-21, 1964. According to Louis, Roux said that he had been not only in Fort Worth but also Dallas, and he had tried to recruit Louis (who had dual French-Mexican citizenship) to participate in an attempt on the life of de Gaulle when he was to visit Mexico in March. What we have shows that the investigation in France was pretty thorough, but it tended to wind down after March 15th when de Gaulle, despite the danger, did go to Mexico.

It is revealed that Roux's patron and host in Fort Worth was one Leon Gaschman, his brother, and his son Arnold.

There are a number of contradictions in Roux's story. Also, there is no explanation of how Souetre and Mertz got into the act. One friend [redacted] believes that Souetre's name came up when the intelligence services checked their files and found an OAS type with a friend in Houston. No one knows how Mertz came up. But, if Alderson is telling the truth about the FBI's interrogation in late 1963, we have only seen the tip of the iceberg.

In any event, see Appendix A for the genesis of the "French Connection."

We had a long and pleasant visit with our lawyer, Prof. Francis Caballero, a French FOIA expert. He set up a meeting with Antoine Pouillieute, one of the counsel to the Consil d'Etat and to the administrative commission which recommends action on FOIA requests. He said that, because of the provisions of the French law, he would have to recommend against release of SDECE and DST files to us. However, he said that he personally was very sympathetic to our cause and suggested three alternate courses of action: (1) attempt to see documents "informally"; (2) wage a press campaign to embarrass the Mitterand Government (especially through Le Monde) into releasing some documents; or (3) have the matter raised during a "Wednesday Question Period" in the French Senate by a Senator. (Caballero says he is dead wrong on the law and shall appeal our case to the Courts.)

Following Pouilliete's second suggestion, we met with M. Bertrand Le Gendre of Le Monde. After some discussion, Le Gendre said that Le Monde would conduct its own investigation, attempt to get documentation, and publish its findings. He will be in touch. Attached as Appendix B hereto is a draft

article which we left with M. Le Gendre for his consideration.

Le Cavelier made us an appointment with Capt. [redacted] of the Gendarmerie, who is currently in charge of all [redacted] activities in France. [redacted] is young (36) and aggressive and promised to help where he could.

[redacted] explained that the political climate in the Socialist Party was ambivalent today, with one wing being traditionally anti OAS, and with one wing promoting a further amnesty for the OAS (wear medals, restore pensions, etc.). There is a new amnesty bill pending in the National Assembly; passage would restrict publication of anti-OAS stories in the French press.

Both [redacted] and Le Cavelier suggested that a current visit to see Souetre in Divonne Les Bains would be (1) dangerous; (2) unproductive (he won't talk); and (3) probably counterproductive. We did not visit Souetre.

According to both [redacted] and Le Cavelier, Mertz was pro-OAS, was caught by the Government in a minor OAS operation, and was "turned" into a double agent and sent to Beaujon, where he informed as to Petit Clamart and ultimately sent to Canada. (This contradicts Mertz's generally pro-de Gaulle attitude, and [redacted]/Le Cavelier may be looking at his SAC "cover" and not his true sentiments; see Document 3 in Appendix A.)

[redacted] also said that Souetre visited the United States and Canada in 1963; he would try to get the details.

We had a meeting on November 16, 1982, at Cafe Alexandre with M. Roland Gaucher and M. Jean Pierre Cohen (Ming Toy Epsteins second cousin?), two old OAS/right wing types, who told us absoluately nothing. Whenever pressed

for specifics, they took to the OAS dialetic "who us." Doctrinaire defense of the OAS.

On Saturday, November 20, we had a meeting with Jean Claude Perez, M.D., ex-chief of O.R.O., the OAS intelligence organization. Dr. Perez was extremely cautious of us (including Le Cavelier), had a tendency to lapse into OAS dialetics and old war stories, but did let slip a few pertinent items:

1. The OAS did dispatch a three-man team to attempt to assassinate de Gaulle in Mexico City in March, 1964;

2. He did meet with Guy Banister in Madrid;

3. The OAS had contact in New Orleans with an anti-Castro group which he called the Rosa Blanca (?);

4. As to Souetre, saw him for the first time in Spain in 1962;

5. The OAS made a real effort to help via right wing U.S. Ambassador to Portugal, Adm. Anderson. They though Anderson would understand "de Gaulle's true nature, i.e., pro-communism"; even Anderson could not swallow this; and

6. Importantly, Perez said that, post 1962, Souetre was part of an ultra-right, ultra-Catholic splinter group which included four men named Pichon, Lefevre, Bourget, and Grossouvre. Group called Integraliste (sp.?).

Perez believes that JFK was killed by anti-communists; he also believes that they "got the wrong man"; believes, despite veneer, that JFK was anti-communist, and equally, despite veneer, de Gaulle was pro-communist. Attached as Appendix C is Dr. Farrell's summary of our conversation with Perez.

We had a number of long private conversations with Le Cavelier, and the investigation in France will continue full steam.

APPENDIX A

1. Document #1 is an article in the Cote-Basque Soir of Bayonne by Louis Assemat-Tessandier, a sometime journalist of dual French-Mexican citizenship, having been born of French parents in Mexico.

Earlier on November 26, 1963, Louis had published that Oswald was not alone in the assassination.

Louis was in Montreal in January, 1964, and was called late at night to come over and meet another Frenchman who had been in Texas, gone to Mexico, and then came to Montreal. Louis said that he went over to Jean's apartment and found her and the Frenchman very drunk. He described the Frenchman as "young officer from Algeria" who wandered back and forth between the three OAS centers in the Western Hemisphere, i.e., Montreal, Mexico City, and Rio.

The Frenchman, whose name Louis would not reveal in the article, was young, tall, sun-tanned, and handsome. He introduced himself as a "former paratroop officer in Algeria" and said that he had arrived that morning by plane from Mexico City. He said that he had been in Dallas at the time of Kennedy's murder but had been expelled by the American police 18 hours later.

"Here's what I know about Dallas. It was a plot of the extreme right. I was at Fort Worth for breakfast and heard JFK deliver his last speech. I knew that in Dallas it would be over for him. I jumped in a plane for Dallas. In Dallas, there was a cross fire with several men shooting. But I won't tell you anything more." Louis implies that he knows more.

When asked about Oswald, "his answer was devastating: an idiot and an innocent in this matter."

"Moreover, now, we (or they) are setting up for Mexico City. DeGaulle is coming in March. Hidden in a crowd of Indians and in all of the confusion, you may be sure that an excellent marksman will do the job. This time it will be like Dallas and not like Petit Clamart."

Although the French officer tried to reach Louis on the phone several times, he neither saw him nor talked to him again.

Forty-eight hours later the arsenal at Montreal was burgled by a group of Frenchmen. Rifles, machine guns, etc., were taken. Joan said that on the next day, the young Frenchman took a direct flight to Mexico City. Joan was frightened of him.

2. Document #2 is a SDECE Memo of February 20, 1964. It summarized the story of the previous day and gives background on Louis Assemat-Tessander. Describes him as intelligent but shaky, a romantic, one who might elaborate but not make up a story out of whole cloth.

3. Document #3 is a memo from the Police Intelligence Chief at Bayonne to Intelligence in Paris, dated February 29, 1964.

Says Louis agreed to come to Bayonne where he was interviewed. Repeated the story. Revealed Roux's name to police.

Louis doesn't know exact date of conversation in Montreal but estimates January 20/21.

Louis reveals additionally that Roux had an incident at the French Consulate at Houston where he became over-friendly with a female secretary.

Louis says that Roux remained two weeks or so in Montreal; telephoned 8 or 10 times to Louis to set up a meeting at the Cafe des Artistes. Louis was frightened and acting on the advice of Andre Malavoy (President of Friendly Society of Escapees from France), Louis did not see him again.

Jean's full name is Bonnier who runs a travel office for Texaco with Eva Gerald. Both girls have met with Roux perhaps 10 times in Cafe des Artistes, which is a meeting place for OAS activists in Montreal.

4. Document #4 is entitled "Intelligence report concerning an individual suspected of preparing an assassination against the President of the French Republic in Mexico." It is a four page document, but we are missing crucial page 2.

Page 1 is a cover sheet and has nothing except the title of the report.

Page 3 seems to be referring to Roux, although this is not entirely clear. He . . . whoever he is . . . claims to have been expelled from Texas within 48 hours of Kennedy's murder. He bragged about flirting with a secretary in the Houston consulate in order to get a visa (to where?) "because he did not want to be recorded as having been in a French consulate in North America." He claimed to have travelled a lot in Latin America and had gone to Montreal to arrange an attempt on de Gaulle. He gave everyone the impression that he was very dangerous, capable of robbing the arsenal, etc.

On page 4, under the heading, "Possible identification of Michel Roux," are four short paragraphs:

"At the direction of Military Security _____, Michel Roux has been discovered in one very important set of photographs. He is supposed to have been identified as ex-Captain Jean Souetre, sentenced to three years in prison, and incarcerated in _____."

"Nevertheless, Roux seems more corpulent than the photos of Souetre that were shown. The lips of Roux are apparently thicker than those of Souetre."

"Enclosed is a photo of Souetre resembling Roux."

"Note that Souetre has a relationship with a dentist in Houston."

There then follows this information relating to Souetre:

"Souetre is an important member of secret French activist organizations (OAS and CNR). He is perfectly capable of organizing assassination attempts or thefts of weapons. His possible presence in North America is particularly disturbing at the time of a visit of General de Gaulle to Mexico."

5. Document #5 is a Proces-Verbal (affidavit) of Michael Roux, taken in Paris on March 7, 1964.

Roux states that his full name is Michel Pierre Gabriel Louis Roux, born August 31, 1940, at Soyaux (Charente). Then gives name of wife, one child, address in Paris.

Military service in 1st Rept. at La Reghiaa (Algeria) in 1961-62. Demobilized in Paris on Oct. 7, 1962, with the grade of Sergent.

"I have learned of the article of Mr. Louis Assemat-Tessandier, published Feb. 19, 1964.

"I contest all of the facts reported there. I will tell you the conditions under which I undertook my trip to North America where I went to try to find work.

"I left Paris on November 19, 1963, destined for Houston. I was to present myself to the Gaschman Company in Ft. Worth for a job that I never received. Then, two or three days later, I returned to Houston where I found no work. About a week later, I went to Mexico City, also to find work, notably at the Bamer Hotel. I left the U.S. because my passport was stamped "visitor" and not "immigrant." I was unable to find work in Mexico. As my financial resources were diminishing, I left that city on January 8, 1964, and I crossed the U.S. border by bus, at Laredo, on January 10, 1964. I crossed the Canadian border on January 13, 1964, at Windsor. From the 12th to the 30th of January I resided at Montreal, 12-39 Dorchester-West. Toward the end of January, I became sick and took a flight to Paris.

"One day, date unknown, I went to the Texaco Building in Montreal, to look for some road maps. I made the acquaitance of two young ladies, "Jean" and "Eva," whose last names I do not know. As they were simpatico, I asked them to have a drink. It was then that they told me of a Frenchman named Louis who was in Montreal and whom I should meet. I told them I would be happy to meet him. They invited me to come have a drink in their apartment at an address which I do not remember, but I believe it was on Pill Street. There "Jean" called Louis on the telephone and said to him: 'I have with me a Frenchman who has arrived from Paris. I am going to put him on the phone.'

I took the phone and told him that I had just arrived from Mexico after a stay in Fort Worth, where I was the day of President Kennedy's murder. Louis asked me what I thought of that affair. I responded that, in my view, Oswald could not have acted alone. I had read the local papers which had given contradictory details. We then spoke of the trip that General de Gaulle was to take to Mexico in March, and I said something to the effect: 'They should reinforce security, because in Mexico people kill at the drop of a hat. They even pay Indians to kill people.'

"I wish to make clear that my only contact with Louis was limited to this one phone conversation. I never saw the man, and I never knew his name until you gave me his article to read. Therefore, I deny the interpretation that Louis gave to my statements. I request to be confronted by him. And I reserve the right to initiate against him any and all legal actions which I judge useful.

"I have nothing to add. I remain at your disposal in case you have further need of me.

"Read, verified, and signed in our presence.

Le Commissaire Principal

/s/ Michel Roux"

6. Document #6 is a very similar Proces Verbal to Document #5, same time, same date. Only difference is a denial of "most" (not all) of the facts in Louis' article. Otherwise the same.

7. Document #7 is dated March 9, 1964, with no heading.

. . . "I have the honor to communicate to you some complementary information on the Assemat-Tessandier affair.

"On March 4, 1964, M. Raspail, intelligence chief at Annemasse, received my instructions . . . Major Roques of Military Security and Assemat-Tessandier, author of (the article).

"Their mission was to make contact with Eva Gerold the young Canadian secretary at Texaco in Montreal, who was visiting in Switzerland and at whose home Assemat-Tessandier had met Michel Roux.

"Eva Gerold, having been informed of the project by the Geneva police, refused to see them.

"On March 5, after French Governmental intervention, Louis Assemat-Tessandier came home alone and was met by M. Raspail at the Contrin airport.

"It was then agreed between the French and Swiss that Louis would return to Geneva on March 6th but that a Swiss police officer would put the following questions to Eva:

"1. What was the name of the Frenchman who paid several visits to your office in Montreal between 1 Jan. and 15 Feb.?

"2. What was the address of this man?

"3. Would she recognize his photo in a group of photos?

"The Canadian girl answered the three questions:

"1. Michel Roux.

"2. She had his address at her office in Montreal and that she would supply it, but she knew that in France it was Angouleme.

"3. Among the photographs which were presented to her, notably that of Souetre, she was not able to recognize the man in question.

"In conclusion, the Swiss asked her if she wished to meet Louis. She replied 'No.'"

* * * * * * *

This document then repeated the questioning of Michel Roux in Paris on March 7th.

Roux added that he got the money to come to North America by selling his car and a loan from his brother-in-law.

He said that Louis wanted to write a sensational article.

8. Document #8 is a sworn Q&A of Michel Roux dated March 9, 1964.

Q. What was your financial situation when you arrived in Montreal?

A. I had between $300-$400. My father had sent me $400 in Mexico, then $100 in Montreal. When I left France, I had a round-trip ticket with a 21 day limit. . . . Men that I knew in the "hotel syndicate" in Houston advised me to go to Mexico City to wait for the deliverance of a permanent U.S. visa for which I had asked. In effect, I made that request of the U.S. Embassy in Mexico on Dec. 19, 1963. After my return to France, I wrote to the U.S. Embassy in Mexico to advise him of my return to Paris, asking that

my permanent visa be sent to me there. My file was sent from Mexico to Paris, and, a week ago, the U.S. Embassy in Paris sent me several forms to fill.

Q. How were you dressed when you arrived in Montreal?

A. In a suit and black leather coat. I do not own blue jeans or a suede jacket.

Q. During your stay in Montreal, did you apply to an airline agency for a refund?

A. No, not in Montreal; but in Mexico I went to the Air France Agency . . . coupon for $201.00.

Q. What Cafe did you frequent in Montreal?

A. The Cafe des Artistes, because many French speaking people went there.

Q. Did you meet any French refugees from North Africa?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you give your address in France to the two young ladies . . .?

A. Yes, the address of my parents in Angouleme. I gave no one my Paris address.

Q. During your stay in Paris did you call Tessandier on the phone?

A. Yes, but not directly. It was always with the assistance of (through the intermediary of) one of the two young ladies that I knew in the Texaco building. I responded simply to the woman who answered the call 'if Louis wishes to meet me, have him come to the Cafe des Artistes.'

Q. Were you in Dallas on the day of the assassination?

A. No.

Q. Did you go to the French Consulate in Houston?

A. No.

Leon Gachman, President of _____ Metals, P.O.B. Address: 2600 Shamrock Street, Fort Worth, has declared on March 10, 1964 that he and his brother visited Paris in October 1963 on a business trip. They stayed at the Hotel Proust, 68 Rue des Martyrs and knew Michel Roux who worked there as a reception clerk.

He told them that he spoke English, German, and French and had spent three years as a Lt. in the French Army, where he had served in Algeria, and had been demobilized. Having taken a course at the hotel school, Roux desired to go the United States and open a restaurant there.

Gachman invited him to come see him if he were ever in the states and suggested Houston as a good place to open a restaurant.

On last Nov. 20th, Roux called Gachman by phone from Houston, and the next day Gachman returns his call and invites him to Fort Worth to see him.

Roux arrived on Nov. 21 by bus, explaining that he had sold his car for funds and that he hoped to find a job and send for his family to come to the U.S. He spent the evening at the Fox Manor Hotel and next day (the 22nd) he accompanied son Arnold to TCU. They were having lunch in the cafeteria when they heard the news of the assassination of the President.

Roux passed the evening at the Gachman home, listening on radio and TV to the commentaries of the events of that day. During his stay, he was in no way implicated with the local police.

He returned to Houston by bus.

On approximately Nov. 24, Gachman went to Houston and saw Roux at the Hotel St. Georges.

He told the clerk that he hae been an officer in the Foreign Legion and had deserted.

He asked him for a letter of introduction to the management of the Bamer Hotel in Mexico City where he was supposed to report.

The last news received from Roux by the informants goes back to Feb. 21, 1964 (postcard from Paris with the address: 46 Rue de Mauberge).

13. Document #13, is dated April 2, 1964, "Object: Identification of John P. Mertz, who left Houston, destined for Mexico City on Nov. 23, 1963."

Reference: your message No. 30 of March 13, 1964.

In response to your cited message, the named John P. Mertz, departing Houston on Nov. 23, 1963, destined for Mexico City, does not seem to identify with the name (Michel Victor Mertz).

(The message then goes on for several pages of description of the life and career of Michel Mertz.)

The document ends as follows:

"Mertz has been back in France since Oct. 1963.

" He has rennovated and lives in a house which he bought in Croissy sur Seine, and he appears to limit his activities to those of a technical advisor."

P. Le Directeur General de la Surete National,
Le Directeur des Renseignements General.
Le Sans-Director
_____David

14. Document #14. Two photos of Souetre.

APPENDIX B

DRAFT OF ARTICLE ON L'AFFAIRE KENNEDY

The French Government is repressing records that might well solve the Affaire Kennedy. Equally interesting, it appears to be hiding the documents at the behest of the American CIA, which has blunted all investigations -- official and otherwise -- for the past nineteen years.

It will be recalled that in 1978 a special investigating committee of the U.S. Congress concluded that President Kennedy was probably killed as the result of a conspiracy, but they were totally unable to identify either the riflemen or those ultimately responsible for the killing. One brief CIA document now available to this newspaper may hold the key to the complex mystery.

In early March of 1964, the American Government began an urgent investigation of three Frenchmen, one or more of whom may have been in Dallas on November 22, 1963, and who were expelled by the American Government . . . presumably to Mexico . . . the next day. At least two of the three Frenchmen were hard-core OAS veterans, who were capable of all sorts of mayhem, and who had no "legitimate business" in Dallas on the day of the murder.

The American investigation ended a few days later, as suddenly as it began -- and without reaching any conclusions. Only very recently has the genesis of the investigation been discovered in some obscure French police files.

It seems that in late February of 1964 a freelance French journalist

attended a party in Montreal. Present was an OAS veteran who, in a drunken state of mind, confessed to having been present in Dallas on November, 1963. More important, he attempted to recruit the journalist, who had dual French-Mexican citizenship, to assist in an OAS plot to assassinate General de Gaulle when he was scheduled to visit Mexico in March. The journalist declined, but he did print his story in an obscure French newspaper, the Cote Basque Soir of Bayonne.

As a result, the French authorities began an urgent investigation and asked the American FBI and CIA to do likewise. However, as the time for de Gaulle's departure approached, French authorities had to decide what threat to his security was posed by the presence in North America of a group of dangerous OAS veterans who may or may not have been involved in the assassination of Kennedy.

They concluded that the threat was very real and very great. However, in true style, the General decided to make the trip anyway. He departed for Mexico on March 16, 1964. The investigation of the threat apparently stopped on both sides of the Atlantic at that time.

From 1964 to the late 1970s the story remained buried. However, ultimately it came to the attention of an American lawyer who was a classmate of John Kennedy at Harvard, and who has researched the President's murder for many years. He has made several trips to Paris in recent years, attempting to see the French investigation of this matter. He wants to see if one or more of the OAS veterans was in fact hired as a mercenary to kill the President.

So far, the French Government has "stone-walled" him, in exactly the same way as the U.S. Government. Despite the fact that he has seen a few documents

from the French file -- and therefore knows of its existence -- the French Government continues to insist that the file no longer exists. Further, he is told that he could not see it, even if it did exist, because it would be an invasion of privacy, etc. etc.

APPENDIX C

Jean-Claude Perez

Interview, Saturday 20 November 1982

Q: Dr Perez, can you tell us something about the relations of the O.A.S. with the nations of the Western Hemisphere?

A: You must understand first of all that the O.A.S. consisted of several factions, of which I represented one. I t had several sections, of which I commanded one. It sheltered several tendancies, of which I held to one. There were those who were more willing to negotiate than I. I held then, and do now, that De Gaulle was the gravest enemy of the Occident. I worked to see him assassinated.

Let me give you an example of our connections with other nations. In 1962 I was living in Spain. The French police applied pressure to the Spanish police, who arrested me. I went to jail in Madrid, but then was [redacted] to South AMerica. Here many states refused to give me asylum. I finally managed to escape from the airport in Brazil and return to [redacted] European the U.S.

Q: Did you know of the O.A.S. centers in Rio, Mexico City, and Montreal?

A: I never heard of anything in Montreal.

Q: How about Mexico City?

A: We knew that De Gaulle was going to visit Mexico City in March of 1964. We sent three men there to establish contacts, recruit assistance, and assassinate him; but they returned and reported that they were unable to organize an attack. Mostly because we did not have any money. This was, after all, after the end of the Algerian war and the O.A.S. was fragmented.

Q: Have you the names of those men?

A: No.

Q: Have you ever heard of a man named Roux, Michel Roux?

A: No.

Q: Michel Victor Mertz?

A: No.

Q: Jean-René Souêtre?

A: Yeah, I know him. He was a member of a splinter. I think he worked for Pichon. You must remember that the O.A.S. has lots of satellite groups not necessarily acting under O.A.S. auspices and not necessarily representing O.A.S. policies. I was in charge of the intelligence-gathering arm, O.R.O.

Q: Did you know of any O.A.S. activities in New Orleans?

A: No.

Q: Did you know of any O.A.S. members training Anticastro guerrillas there?

A: No.

Gilbert Lecalevier breaks in, tells him that, yes, there were some.

A: No. That, I don't believe. No. Don't believe it. Listen, let me finish the example I started out with. Anyway, I was refused by all the states in South America, but Portugal eventually took me in. What they asked for that favor, in return, was that we work with their secret police. That is the kind of relation we had with foreign states. Never direct or public. Of all the clandestine organizations I know of, we were the only one that NEVER received any aid from any outside government--NEVER. The only one.

We tried again and again to initiate contacts, but these had to be casual, cautious, under-the-table. We sent out feelers, yes, even documents, reports, proposals, propositions, but never did we receive any reply to them. No formal response of any kind. It was as though the conclusion were foregone. In Africa, for example, the United States and France were conducting a policy of reality against the Portuguese, supporting nationalist candidates. De Gaulle of course supported the one who was most to the left, as always. The West could never seem to understand this. An American business man once told me: "You O.A.S. people are right, but we cannot openly support you unless you win." Curious circular reasoning. History, of course, is written by the winners.

Getting back to De Gaulle. He was a communist. We could see it. No one else. De Gaulle pulled off the trick of the century: he moved the "right" to the left. No one but a nominal rightist could have got away with freeing our Algerian colony. If Mendes-France has tried it, would have been a revolution. De Gaulle was a wolf in sheep's clothing. He mascaraded as rightist, but was in fact the greatest enemy of the West. Kennedy, on the other hand, although he occasionally made liberal noises, was a great thinker, understood a larger picture, was the West's greatest hope.

Q: Why in your opinion was Kennedy shot then?

A: It was most likely by mistake. He appeared, as I have said, superficially liberal. We knew better, despite his statements for Algerian independence.

Q: You know that he made violent (pro-Algerian independence) speeches to that effect in Congress?

A: Yes, but it was his larger design that made him the hero of the Occident. De Gaulle embraced on every occasion the advantage of the East. His deception was the opposite of Kennedy's. There is the irony.

[Interrogator observes that Nixon's recognition of China, coming from an ardent anticommunist, may be similar. Perez doesn't see the parallel at first, then agrees upon reflection.]

Q: Does the name Espaillot mean anything to you?

A: Not a thing.

Q: How about Bannister?

A: Hmmmmm. Seems to me I once met a Bannister, tall, older, said to be a former F.B.I. man. Met him in Madrid.

Q: What was his relation tothe O.A.S.?

A: Just met him. You must not assume from meeting that contact and support were the same thing. I see here in your resumé that you claim we were financed by Nagy on account of a meeting. False. We were constantly meeting with eopple in an attempt to recruit support. It was rarely forthcoming. We tried, for example, through the goddaughter of the commander of Spanish-based American Forces, William Donovan, to make contact with the U.S.

Q: The Donovan, commander of the wartime O.S.S.? That one?

A: Yes. We also tried to make indirect contacts trhough friends and acquaintances with Admiral Anderson (was that the name?) the U.S. [redacted] ambassador. We could never make contact. Some of these high-ranking military men were noted for right-wing positions. We thought we would get a sympathetic hearing. We could never get an interview.